

END OF DR. BRIGGS'S SPEECH.

DR. LAMPE WILL REPLY THIS AFTERNOON.

DECISION OF DR. BLISS AGAINST THE DEFENDANT—SCRIPTURE AUTHENTICITY AND PROGRESSIVE SACRIFICIATION.

The Briggs heresy trial was continued yesterday in the Scotch Presbyterian Church. Dr. Briggs occupied the entire time, finishing his defence. Dr. J. J. Lampe, representing the prosecution, gained the floor to reply, but before he began, Dr. Briggs raised the point of order that the Book of Discipline did not allow a rebuttal, but that he should not object to the prosecution having an opportunity to be heard. If the Presbytery were willing and certain restrictions were adopted, becoming animated in his remarks, the defendant said:

"They have asked the point of order and up to this time you have given it. The question now is whether they shall have the blood also."

Dr. Briggs said that he should ask a ruling of the Moderator as to whether the committee had the right to be heard, adding that he feared that it would claim the right to do exactly what it pleased. Dr. Bliss decided that the point of order was not well taken. Dr. Briggs appealed from this decision to the Presbytery, but the Moderator was sustained by a large majority. Dr. Lampe will, therefore, have the floor when the Presbytery meets at 2 o'clock to-day, and will probably occupy a part of the session to-morrow. Colonel McCook said that the prosecution would probably end its case to-morrow night. Then the Presbytery will take up the charges in private session, but it is hardly probable that a decision will be reached this year.

In the front seat back of Dr. Briggs yesterday, sat Charles Butler and his daughter, Miss Butler, with Dr. Hastings and Dr. Brown, of the Seminary, while across the aisle in the front seat sat two members of the well-known Field family, David Dudley, considerably over four score years, and his youngest son, Henry, thirty. The general editor of "The Evangelist," with Dr. Charles E. West, who declared that he had settled the question of sanctification for himself twenty-five years ago, and the Rev. Mr. Lockwood, a graduate of Union Seminary nearly forty years ago, William E. Dodge, the Rev. P. S. Hulbert, of the Marble Collegiate Church; the Rev. W. W. Giles, a young Baptist Minister who has scarcely missed a session during the trial; Dr. George, of Brooklyn, and not a few Presbyterians and Reformed brethren from New-Jersey, were present to hear the closing argument of the accused professor.

DR. BLISS GIVES A RULING.

Dr. Bliss's decision on the point of order raised by the defendant was as follows:

The Moderator is compelled to decide that the question of order is not well taken, and for these reasons:

First—That the usage in such cases is against the point which is raised.

Second—That usage is based upon the law of the Church governing complaints and appeals, which distinctly give us this order of the opening and the closing being on the part of those who present their case—the Reformed and the Presbyterian.

Third—That the parties cannot be said to have been heard until the prosecution has had a full opportunity to present its whole case. It has only presented a part of that case so far. It has taken a very small portion of time compared with that accorded to the defendant.

You do not hear the defendant's case until the prosecution has had a full opportunity to present its whole case. It has only presented a part of that case so far. It has taken a very small portion of time compared with that accorded to the defendant.

DR. BRIGGS'S CLOSING ARGUMENT.

The argument of Dr. Briggs yesterday was in answer to Charges IV, V, VI, relating to the authorship of the Pentateuch and the Book of Isaiah and progressive sanctification after death. Dr. Briggs said that he had submitted a volume entitled "Who Wrote the Pentateuch?" or the Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," giving each member a copy, and at the close presenting his entire defence in pamphlet form to the members of the court. In discussing the authenticity of Holy Scripture, Dr. Briggs said that it was probable that the underlying motive in those who have admitted the revision of the first chapter of the Westminster Confession, inserting "the truthfulness of its history" and "the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle," was a desire to use them as a purge to the Presbyterian Church," adding:

"If, therefore, you recognize that the clause 'consent of all the parts' is an essential article of the confession, we shall be obliged to conclude that the proposed additions to the first chapter will also become essential articles, if adopted. In that case I suggest that the simplest way in which the Higher Critics can be purged from the Church is by the adoption of this revision, and by the decision of the supreme court of the Church of this simple question, whether 'consent of all the parts' is an essential article of our Confession. I suggest that the 'consent of all the parts' of Holy Scripture is a fact attested by a scientific study of the Bible. I also agree that this fact and the other facts adduced in the Confession are evidences that Scripture is the word of God. I also agree that the fact of the truthfulness of the history and the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle," and I do not and I cannot agree that there are internal evidences that the Scriptures are the word of God. It is not the facts that are in question, it is whether these facts are valid evidences for Holy Scripture. I maintain that if the 'consent of all the parts' is an essential article of the confession, as it is in the revision, then it will be claimed, if the revision succeeds, that 'the truthfulness of the history and the faithful witness of prophecy and miracle' are essential articles as evidences that the Scripture is the word of God; and all who cannot subscribe to these evidences will be obliged to retire from the Presbyterian Church."

SHALL CALVIN OR SHEED BE FOLLOWED?

Referring to the "irreconcilable difference between the parties who propose to resort to the same tribunal and to seek the same guidance," he said:

Will you follow Calvin or Dr. Sheed, the Reformers or the Hodges, Westminster theology or Princeton theology? Look at the gulf into which these dogmatic theories are leading the Presbyterian Church. Are you prepared to array our Church against the Biblical scholars of the world? Are you resolved at all hazards to stem the onrushing tide of Biblical criticism? As honorable Christian gentlemen try me by the Confession. You cannot honorably try me by a new dogma. I am a modern school of theology, and used as a substitute for the Westminster doctrine. If you should do such a thing, think you that the counterfeits will not be exposed to the Christian world? You would dash our Church to pieces against the roaring waves of an outraged scholarship, and an outraged Christianity."

THE PENTATEUCH AND ISRAEL.

The authorship of Isaiah was discussed briefly, the defendant having submitted a large part of the answer to Charge V in printed form. He summed up his arguments on Charges IV and V as follows:

1. There is no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

2. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

3. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

4. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

5. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

6. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

7. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

8. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

9. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

10. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

11. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

12. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

13. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

14. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

15. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

16. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

17. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

18. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

19. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

20. The Westminster Confession of Faith nowhere states that Moses wrote the Pentateuch or that Isaiah wrote the whole of the book that bears his name. Therefore there can be no lawful bridge by which these specifications, that Moses is not the author of the Pentateuch and that Isaiah is not the author of half of the book that bears his name," can be brought under the charges. Therefore there is no relevancy in the specifications—they cannot be accounted as valid.

HODGMAN'S MACKINTOSHES

CHRISTMAS GIFTS

There are no lawless cases against me in the Presbyterian Church.

The testimony of Holy Scripture in the passages adduced does not show that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and that Isaiah wrote the book that bears his name. Therefore my statements are not in conflict with Holy Scripture and there is no valid case against me on the ground of Holy Scripture.

HODGMAN RUBBER COMPANY,

BROADWAY, 21 West 23d St., Cor. Grand Street, adj. 5th Ave. Hotel.

there can be no lawless case against me in the Presbyterian Church.

The testimony of Holy Scripture in the passages adduced does not show that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and that Isaiah wrote the book that bears his name. Therefore my statements are not in conflict with Holy Scripture and there is no valid case against me on the ground of Holy Scripture.

(4) Holy Scripture makes it evident that Moses did not write the Pentateuch and that Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name. Therefore my statements are true and the prosecution are in conflict with Holy Scripture.

In the fear of God and in the light of evidence you should decide. You cannot decide on the basis of your opinions and prejudices, without violating the laws of the Church and the law of God.

SANCTIFICATION AFTER DEATH.

The last charge, regarding progressive sanctification, was considered at considerable length. The doctrine of the Westminster Standards, and the doctrine of Holy Scripture were carefully expounded. Dr. Briggs expressing the regret that Henry B. Smith, who declared that "Eschatology ought to be Christologized," did not turn his own attention to that theme, and give the fruits of his investigations. Dr. Briggs said his attention to this subject many years ago, "said the speaker, 'in his book on 'The Sin against the Holy Ghost,' and has addressed not a few valuable lectures in his later publications." In discussing the Middle State, Dr. Briggs said:

It is impossible that Augustine, Calvin and Luther will be found in the same class room as the redeemed negro slave or the babe that has entered heaven today. The fathers and doctors of the Church will be the teachers of the dead, as they taught the living. . . . The Church is chiefly in the intermediate state. The Church on earth is only the outside of it. . . . The modern Church ought to return to the faith of the ancient Church and believe in the 'Communion of Saints.'"

Dr. Briggs gave his doctrine of progressive sanctification as follows:

The true doctrine, which is older than purgatory and which has ever been taught by the soundest divines, is that the believers after death attain complete rest, peace and progress in sanctification until they attain Christlikeness and perfect purity and holiness at his second advent, when body and soul are united in the resurrection, and the whole man for the first time attains complete redemption and glorification. Sanctification begins in justification and attains its end only in the glorification of the judgment day.

After an interesting discussion of the doctrine, Dr. Briggs said in closing:

I have gone over all the charges made against the doctrine set forth in my inaugural address. I have shown that the doctrine taught by me is not in conflict with the Westminster Confession, but that they are in accord therewith; that they are not in conflict with the Scriptures, but are the product of a comprehensive study of the Scriptures. They set forth the doctrine of the Bible, which has been put forth by the Presbytery of New-York to make its decision. I pray God you may make no mistake, but that you may stand firmly by the Word of God and the constitution of our Church, and so deliver a righteous verdict."

PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN UNITY.

The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church last spring passed a minute suggesting a conference among the home missionary boards of the various denominations, in order to devise some means of obviating the unnecessary multiplication of churches.

This meeting took place at the Bible House yesterday. The Rev. Dr. Roberts, of the Presbyterian Board of Home Missions, presided, and were present: Messrs. Rogers, of the American Home Mission Society and the Home Missionary Board of the Reformed (Dutch) Church. A general discussion took place, from which it appeared that in some towns throughout the West and South, where home missionary societies were contemplating the founding of churches, much money could be saved; in certain cases three or four churches of different denominations existed or were under consideration, where only one is needed.

The conference decided that the Western representatives of the four societies should be instructed to inquire carefully as to the existence of other churches before they began work, and to guard against an undue multiplication of churches. They decided also that in disputed cases, where two or more denominations desired to found churches in the same town, and neither is willing to yield, the matter shall be referred to a conference committee on the ground of Christian unity, and that they should endeavor to decide which one has the right to the extension of the others.

PLANS FOR THE BIG CHRISTMAS SHOW.

The office of the Christmas Society in Madison square Garden begins to look like Santa Claus's storehouse. All the arrangements for the big entertainment are completed. Toys by wholesale are piled in the garden, candy, gingerbread and apples are being received, and a large number of children are selected daily through various organizations. The society wants to provide for 20,000 children, and it depends solely upon the generosity of the people how many of the desired number the society can provide for.

Contributions are earnestly requested, and every 25 cents given to the society will enable it to provide for a child to the entertainment. Cappa's 7th Avenue Band, the royal Japanese jugglers, the company of trained dogs and the trio of acrobats make a fine programme for the children. Five thousand dollars, only one cent of which has been received, will be required to defray the expenses of the entertainment, and no contribution will be too small to help the work.

SHAREHOLDERS TWO DAYS AHEAD OF TIME.

New-Haven, Conn., Dec. 19.—Owing to an error, many of the state newspapers said this morning that the postponed meeting of the stockholders of the New-York, New-Haven and Hartford Railroad would be held here to-day, and in consequence of this a large number of the shareholders from all over the State were at the station. The call for the meeting states that it should be held here on Wednesday, December 21, when action shall be taken on the lease of the Providence and Worcester road. President Clark and Vice-President Tuttle, who were attending a meeting of the directors of the Connecticut River road, were disappointed on Saturday evening, as was stated yesterday.

MORTALLY WOUNDED BY A BURLAR.

Chicago, Dec. 19.—Frederick J. Austin, of No. 4514 Prairie-ave., was mortally wounded at an early hour this morning. Mr. Austin was entering his home when he pulled down his revolver and asked them what they wanted. Several shots were exchanged, one of which struck Mr. Austin in the stomach. He fell to the sidewalk and while lying prostrate he emptied his revolver at the men. It is thought that one of them is wounded, for a trail of blood in the snow marked the course by which they escaped. A policeman heard the shots and ran to the scene. A doctor said Mr. Austin's wound would prove fatal.

HARRIS GETS A WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS.

Carlyle W. Harris, convicted of murder in the first degree for poisoning his wife, Helen Potts Harris, obtained a writ of habeas corpus yesterday from Judge Russell, of the Court of Oyer and Terminer, through his counsel, William F. Howe. Harris is in the Tombs pending his appeal to the Court of Appeals. He alleges that the Sheriff is about to transfer him to Sing Sing, in spite of the stay of proceedings granted to him, and he wishes to prevent it. The writ is returnable to-day.

CONSOLIDATED EXCHANGE BROKERS SUSPENDED.

Two Consolidated Exchange brokers suspended yesterday owing to their inability to make their weekly settlements. They were E. W. Moss, whose liabilities amounted to \$2,500, and R. E. Preusser, who failed for \$500. Their holdings were not sold out, and it is expected that both men will resume business to-day.

NEW-YORK CENTRAL, BEST LINE TO THE WEST; TWELVE FAST TRAINS EVERY DAY. See time-table.

DIVIDING PUBLIC MONEY.

AN INCREASE IN THE APPROPRIATIONS.

THE MUSEUM OF ART GETS \$70,000—MAYOR GRANT MAKES A PLEA FOR ECONOMY.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art received \$70,000 from the Board of Estimate yesterday, and the American Museum of Natural History got \$65,000 for the year 1893. This is an increase of \$20,000 for the Museum of Art and \$15,000 for the Natural History Museum over the sums allowed in the provisional estimates of October. The Art Museum's demand was for \$65,000, but the trustees compromised with the Park Commissioners on a total of \$62,000, upon the conditions that a bill to be sent to the Legislature storing the two pay days in each week shall receive the board's approval. The same arrangement was made by the National History trustees, who fixed their figures at \$65,000, but the Board of Estimate thought \$62,000 for the Art Museum was too much, and reduced the sum to \$70,000.

A report made to the Controller by the Collector of City Revenues gives the Art Museum salary list for 1892 as \$36,794.44; additional for Sunday opening, \$12,225.11; sundries, \$7,320.62; total, \$56,340.17.

In the trustees' estimate \$67,055 was asked for salaries; \$15,025 for expenses and \$14,205 for additional help for the new north wing, which will not be finished until July. General De Cossack's salary as director is increased from \$20,000 to \$21,000; three curators, from \$2,500 to \$3,200 each; assistant treasurer, \$1,500 to \$2,200; director's secretary, from \$2,000 to \$2,500; two clerks, from \$900 to \$1,200 each; one custodian, from \$1,200 to \$2,200; one auditor, from \$1,200 to \$1,500; one engineer, from \$1,500 to \$1,600; one assistant engineer, from \$1,400 to \$1,600; three firemen, from \$2,000 to \$2,100 and twenty-six attendants, from \$1,712 to \$1,925. The Museum's income in 1892 was \$55,758.05; in 1890, \$55,578.09, and in 1891, \$41,106.06—derived from funds, membership fees, gate-money on pay-days and sales of catalogues. During the present year, with the entrance fees abolished the income has fallen to \$14,335.01. At least, this is the trustees' estimate.

The net expenses for 1893 are estimated by the trustees at \$53,900.99. Deducting the item of \$14,225 for additional help for the north wing, which is not likely to be ready for opening next year, would reduce the net expenses for 1893 to \$68,744.99. The Controller therefore assumed that \$70,000 would be a liberal appropriation.

President Dana, who represented the Park Department, protested strongly against cutting the Art Museum's allowance below \$72,000, as agreed upon by the trustees and the Museum trustees. When the trustees applied to the Controller for the restoration of the two pay days on these days.

When the Board of Estimate started in on the final budget yesterday Mayor Grant presented the following statement, which was ordered upon file:

In taking up for consideration the final estimate of the amounts required to pay the expenses of conducting the city government, it is the duty of the Board of Estimate to consider the city's financial condition, and to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

The city of New-York is in a very bad financial condition, and it is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

This increased amount of State tax for this year, with many other items which are not subject to the discretion of the Board of Estimate, will result in a total of \$1,100,000,000, which is a very large sum for the city to pay.

It must be remembered that we are making appropriations at this time for the administration of our government, and while it is the duty of the members of this board to provide ample means to conduct the city government on a liberal scale, it is also the duty of the members of this board to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

The final budget for 1893 was \$2,881,265.10, and the provisional budget for 1893, with the increased amount of State tax included, amounts to \$3,771,008.32, showing a net increase of \$889,743.22, or \$26.15 per capita, less than the increased amount required for 1892.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

It is the duty of the Board of Estimate to make such adjustments as may be necessary to maintain the city's credit and to provide for the city's needs.

</